UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/570,641	09/29/2006	Julia Greil	G-33347-A-BCK 9942	2928	
	84983 7590 10/13/2010 SandozAG (Austria)- LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.			EXAMINER	
P.O.BOX 1871			QAZI, SABIHA NAIM		
Knoxville, TN 37901			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1628		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/13/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/570,641	GREIL ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Sabiha Qazi	1628			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)☑	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ju	dv 2010				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)□	<i>,</i> —					
ا ال	- ' '					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1 and 3-26 is/are pending in the applic	cation.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>11-25</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
· · _ ·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 3-10 and 26</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
<i>'</i> =	· · · ——	alastian requirement				
8)	Claim(s) <u>11-25</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
-	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
7-7	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
The path of declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached office Action of form 1 10-132.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
2)  Notic 3) Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	te			

10/570,641

Art Unit: 1628

# **Final Office Action**

Page 2

Claims 1, 3-26 are pending. Amendments are entered.

## **Summary of this Office Action**

- 1. Information Disclosure Statement
- 2. Copending Applications
- 3. Specification
- 4. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection
- 5. Response to Remarks
- 6. Conclusion
- 7. Communication

10/570,641

Art Unit: 1628

Page 3

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

Copies of the foreign patents are not provided by the Applicants therefore not considered. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

#### **Copending Applications**

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

10/570,641 Page 4

Art Unit: 1628

### **Specification**

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3-10 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No.4, 748,173. See the entire document especially lines 25-68 in column 10 and formula "F" in line 44 of column 10,, abstract, lines 21-68 in column 7, column 8.

The reference teaches the compounds Formula I can be converted to the desired compounds of formula I by treatment with appropriate amine of formula F.

The reference teaches heterocyclic aminoalkyl esters of mycophenolic acid, the derivatives and the pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof, useful as

Art Unit: 1628

immunosuppressive agents, anti-inflammatory agents, anti tumor agents, anti viral agents and anti psoriatic agents.

Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming a broader scope of the invention.

It would have obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was filed to prepare an amino derivative of mycophenolate mofetil and purify it because the reference teaches the derivatization by amino compounds. One would prepare the compound and purify it for use. So the purification of the derivatives would have been prima facie obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was filed. No new concept or unexpected results are noted by the Examiner. The data presented in the specification does not commensurate with the scope of the claims.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

## **Response to Remarks**

Applicant's response filed on 7/23/10 is hereby acknowledged. Applicant's election of group I, claims 1, 2 and 3-10 are provisionally elected with traverse is acknowledged. Applicant's arguments were fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that prior does not teach nor suggest the removal of

by-products which includes a dimer (II) as on page 8 of the response. Even if the

reference does not specifically states "dimer" one skilled in the art the time the

invention was made would clearly understand that the by-products may contain

various compounds. It appears that Applicant have identified the compound which

is dimer from the by-products which does not make the claimed process novel.

The rejection is maintained.

In order to expedite the prosecution Applicant may consider calling the Examiner to discuss the issues.

#### Conclusion

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the

10/570,641

Art Unit: 1628

Page 8

advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fetterolf Brandon can be reached on (571) 272-2919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/570,641

Art Unit: 1628

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to

the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or

571-272-1000.

/Sabiha Qazi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612